



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

PR SK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/064,973	04/23/98	VIDOLIN M	3.0-001

EZRA SUTTON  
PLAZA 9 900 ROUTE 9  
WOODBIDGE NJ 07095

PM82/1008

EXAMINER
MILLER, W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

4

DATE MAILED: 10/08/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/064,973

Applicant(s)

Vidolin et al.

Examiner

William Miller

Group Art Unit

3628

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 27, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-20, and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-20, and 22-26 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 3628

**Specification**

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doppenschmitt (U.S. Pat. No. 1,694,703) in view of Knodel (U.S. Pat. No. 4,179,833).

Doppenschmitt discloses a bracelet/necklace comprising: an outer fabric material (2); an inner elastic material (3); and a plurality of closed loop members (1) having indicia thereon (page 2, lines 1-3).

With regards to claims 1 and 13, Doppenschmitt fails to disclose a releasable closure means for opening and closing the bracelet/necklace. Knodel discloses a resilient bracelet having a releasable closure means (12) for opening and closing the bracelet in the form of hook and loop fasteners (Velcro). Therefore, as taught by Knodel, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the bracelet/necklace of

Art Unit: 3628

Doppenschmitt to include a releasable closure means for opening and closing the bracelet in the form of hook and loop fasteners (Velcro) thereby enhancing securement thereof to the body.

With regards to claims 2, 3, 5, 14-16, and 18, Doppenschmitt fails to disclose the specific outer fabric material, inner elastic material, and closed loop material as claimed by the applicant. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the specific outer fabric material, inner elastic material, and closed loop material as claimed by the applicant, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

With regards to claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 26, Doppenschmitt fails to disclose the indicia being imprinted or embroidered and of the specific design, symbol, or color as claimed by the applicant. However, it is being viewed as an obvious matter of engineering design choice to modify the bracelet/necklace by utilizing an indicia being imprinted or embroidered and of the specific design, symbol, or color as claimed by the applicant, since the applicant has not disclosed that the specific design or type of indicia solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the bracelet/necklace would perform equally well with any suitable design or type of indicia. Further, with regards to claims 7 and 20, the applicant is reminded that method limitations, namely gluing, sewing, stapling, heat sealing, or laser fusion, carry no patentable weight in an article claim.

With regards to claim 12, although Doppenschmitt, as modified by Knodel, fails to disclose the specific method of using the bracelet as claimed by the applicant, Doppenschmitt, as modified by Knodel, does disclose all the claimed structure of the bracelet and therefore it is being viewed as

Art Unit: 3628

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the bracelet as claimed by the applicant.

**Response to Amendment**

The applicant argues that Doppenschmitt fails to disclose the beads being slidably removable from the bracelet, i.e. exchangeable, and also fails to disclose the beads having any indicia for identification purposes. The examiner disagrees as according to page 1, line 106, through page 2, line 3, the beads have openings therethrough such that the beads are strung directly upon the bracelet. Moreover, the beads also slidably removable from the bracelet via their openings. Further, Doppenschmitt does disclose indicia for identification purposes as the beads are "suitable colored or ornamented in any desired way to provide an article of the desired design and degree of ornamentality".

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/064,973

Page 5

Art Unit: 3628

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Miller whose telephone number is (703) 305-3978.

W.L.M. *WM*

October 7, 1999

*Brian K. Green*  
BRIAN K. GREEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 800  
3628